

Furthermore, he said that he wanted to improve bilateral relations with Pakistan and that he wanted to conduct ranging talks with Pakistan that incorporated long-term vision.

Although a recent meeting between India and Pakistan's prime ministers did not lead to concrete and positive results, they may meet again in South Africa later this month, and I am hoping that they will meet and resolve some issues that have kept them apart and begin talks for peace in south Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to learn that the U.N. Conference on Disarmament is close to beginning new talks on halting the production of nuclear bomb fissile material. India, a member of the conference, has agreed to take an active role in the talks; and ironically, India and Pakistan's nuclear tests have revived the talks after they stalled for 3 years.

When we return from the August recess, I look forward to working with Members of this body in giving the President proper sanction waiver authority so that he may have more flexibility in imposing sanctions. Senator BROWNBACK has amended the Senate agricultural appropriations bill so that the President would have a limited waiver authority. And this amendment is similar to the proposal put forward by the Senate Task Force on Sanctions.

Although the House agricultural appropriations bill does not include a similar amendment, I hope that my colleagues will include the amendment in the conference report. I have introduced similar language to the Brownback amendment and the Senate task force proposal, and I urge my colleagues in the House to support the Brownback amendment and give the President proper waiver authority.

When India conducted nuclear tests earlier this year, for a period of time there was no dialogue between our two countries, but now we are talking and determined to maintain peace in south Asia. To encourage such dialogue, President Clinton should continue with his plans to visit India, probably this November. It has been almost 20 years since a U.S. President has been to south Asia, and if the President is serious about peace and nuclear non-proliferation, he should go to India.

Mr. Speaker, I have a large Indian American constituency in my district in New Jersey, and this community feels very strongly that U.S.-India relations need to prosper, regardless of the two countries' views towards nuclear tests. One leader in the community, Dr. Sunil Jaitly, recently noted that the gap between India and the United States is not large and that the differences can be resolved. Dr. Jaitly said, and I agree, that "the U.S. and India need to express to each other clearly and open-heartedly" so that "we may eliminate any and all misunderstandings created by the May 1998 events."

Mr. Speaker, finally, I want to say that it is important that we support

the administration and India in their efforts to reconcile their differences in an effort to bring peace not only to south Asia, but throughout the world.

#### TRANSFER OF AMERICAN TECHNOLOGY TO CHINESE COMMUNISTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUNTER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, on April 30 of this year, I came to the floor of the House to use 1 hour of time available to me in a special order to discuss a matter of utmost importance to the security of our country and the safety of the American people.

In that special order, which I gave on April 30, I disclosed information that indicated that American aerospace firms, with the acquiescence of officials in the Clinton administration, and perhaps the President himself, had facilitated the transfer of sophisticated rocket technology to the Communist Chinese. If true, I stated, Americans have been put in jeopardy and that this could be the worst technological betrayal of our country since the Rosenbergs.

For those of my colleagues who do not remember the Rosenbergs, the Rosenbergs were people who worked for the United States in our own program to develop an atomic bomb during World War II; who, for whatever reason, gave the secrets of producing that atomic bomb to Communist Russia, to the Soviet Union when it was under the control of Joseph Stalin.

Well, today, unfortunately, it appears that some major American aerospace companies may well have given to the world's worst abuser of human rights, tyrants that are on the par with Joseph Stalin and Mao Tse Tung and other tyrants of the past, may have given them secrets that we developed during the Cold War for our own protection. They have given them those secrets in a way which will increase their capability of building rockets that could hit the United States with nuclear weapons.

Mr. Speaker, I take the floor again today to update my colleagues and interested parties on what has happened since my initial disclosure, as well as disclose new information that has come to light concerning the use of technology developed and paid for by the U.S. taxpayers, handed over to the Communist Chinese.

First and foremost, since my first address, nothing has emerged that suggests that my original statements were inaccurate. The more information that becomes available, the more certain it becomes that aerospace firms like Loral Space and Communications, Hughes and Motorola, callously disregarded the security of our country. To be fair on this, Hughes Corporation

denies that they have done anything to improve Communist Chinese rocket capability, and is taking steps to provide me with information which they believe will demonstrate this fact and will demonstrate the fact they have remained true to the United States.

Hughes notwithstanding, there is ample evidence that American technology was transferred to this hostile potential enemy of the United States and that the vast experience of some of our best aerospace engineers provided the Communist Chinese the guidance needed to upgrade and perfect highly sophisticated weapons systems, increasing the reliability and capability of Communist Chinese rockets. This has given what anyone has to admit is at least a potential enemy of the United States, a better ability to deliver nuclear warheads to our country, to American cities, to incinerate millions of our people.

Did the Communist Chinese have that capability before? Yes, they did, minimally, have that capability. Perhaps they could have gotten a rocket to us. But now, thanks to American know-how, given them by American aerospace companies, their rockets are more accurate and are more reliable, and now their rockets can kill more than one nuclear warhead, and this, thanks to American know-how.

I expected, after my first speech on this issue, that the companies in question would protest that I was wrong, that my fears were unfounded, that my sources had exaggerated the damage being done to our security. That has not been the case. The dangers to our country may, in fact, have been understated. Since disclosing the limited information I uncovered, there have been several hearings in the House and in the Senate looking into this horrific possibility that the money that we Americans spent developing technology to defend us ended up perfecting Communist Chinese rockets, and in the House, a select committee of nine distinguished Members has been appointed. Under the leadership of the gentleman from California (Mr. COX), this select committee is now organizing its efforts to thoroughly investigate the situation.

One of the executives in question is Bernard Schwartz of Loral. Schwartz was hell-bent to sell an arsenal of high-tech weapons to the Communist Chinese, weapons that would have put tens of thousands of American military personnel in jeopardy, our military personnel, our sons and daughters on our ships or in our airplanes. In any future confrontation between the United States and China, our military people would have been put in jeopardy of being shot out of the air, blown out of the water, and murdered by Communist Chinese who are being armed with technology that was developed by the United States for our own defense.

This is what Bernard Schwartz wanted to sell to the Communist Chinese. We do not know exactly how much of

this lethal weapons-related technology Loral was able to transfer. He was stopped in many cases, and he was not given permission in many cases. But what is clear, that when it comes to the upgrading of China's rocket system, which could land a nuclear weapon here, Loral was anxious to help, and in fact there is evidence to indicate that the weapons systems, that these missiles were improved with Loral's help.

According to reports, on February 6, 1996, a Chinese long march rocket carrying a \$200 million Loral satellite, exploded shortly after its launch from a satellite launch center in China. Loral and the Hughes Corporation went to work on an accident review for the insurance companies who insured that flight and insured the coverage of that loss.

First of all, we need to understand that it is illegal for corporations to transfer this weapons technology and to upgrade rockets, so there was no excuse whatsoever for Hughes and Loral to be going through an accident investigation that was involving only the blow-up of a Chinese rocket, not the malfunction of a satellite system. There should have been no discussions whatsoever.

The Chinese Government, once Loral and Hughes jumped into analyzing what had gone wrong with this launch, the Chinese Government requested a Chinese-born Loral executive named Dr. Wah Lim, to be put in charge of this report. Loral complied with this request, and replaced an experienced American U.S. Air Force colonel who was at that time responsible for the launch security, and they replaced this man, this American military officer at Loral, they replaced him with Dr. Lim, who had been requested by the Communist Chinese. One wonders why that happened. One wonders what justification there could be in that.

In May 1996, the 200-page accident review, this report that dealt with this rocket's performance, was finished and this again had nothing to do with the satellite, it had to do with the explosion of the rocket. This report was unlawfully faxed by Dr. Lim, the man who the Chinese had requested be on this team, this report was faxed to the Communist Chinese themselves without either a State Department or Defense Department approval.

One year later, when the Pentagon completed an assessment of what had happened, an assessment of this report, and Dr. Lim's actions taken to provide this report to the Communist Chinese, our Defense Department concluded, and I quote: "The United States national security has been harmed," end of quote.

To put that in terms that my colleagues might understand, now millions of Americans live under the threat of being incinerated by a nuclear weapon launched at the United States from China, and made more accurate and made more reliable by our own aerospace industry.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken with a former security monitor for U.S. space launches overseas who has monitored Loral launches in the former Soviet Union and in China. He claims to have witnessed serious lapses in the security of U.S. satellites and these rocket launches in both countries. In addition, the Cox committee will be looking into reports by the Defense Department officials who were present at Loral's launches in China. We are talking especially about that launch in February of 1996.

The mass of information is somewhat confusing, but to begin with, the report that we are talking about that went to the Communist Chinese, this was supposedly for insurance companies, and the one that of course ended up going directly to the Chinese Communist rocket builders is not just a general assessment. It turns out that that report that was put together by Loral and Hughes engineers, it is not just a road map, it is kind of a blueprint, if you will, for perfecting the Chinese Communist long march rocket system.

That rocket system, before the American intervention, before our experts started talking to the Communist Chinese, had blown up four times in a row. It was one of the world's most unreliable systems. But the suggestions that they were given were so precise that it was not just trying to perfect things and make things better, it was so precise it included such things as make sure, and I will use terms that are not classified terms, turn this widget and replace it with a "thingamabob." Make sure that the settings on the "what'a-ya-call-it" panel are turned this way. And even a layman like myself, with very little technological background, but even I could read and see that this was a blueprint for improving a Communist Chinese rocket system and had nothing to do with the satellite itself. It was clearly instructions on how to dramatically improve that Communist Chinese rocket system.

And guess what? Think about it. After these meetings and after this report was put in the hands of the Communists, well, guess what? After they got their advice from, their technological advice from their American buddies, this particular Communist Chinese rocket system flew successfully, and has continued to fly successfully. Now it is a reliable rocket system, from the most unreliable in the world to a very reliable system. No more explosions. It is a perfected system. The trouble is, that same system is identical, although it is carrying American satellites now, it is identical to the system that carries nuclear warheads, atomic bombs. The difference between that rocket system and the one that carries the weapons to kill us, the only difference, one is painted a pastel color and is very beautiful and the other may have military painting on it.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my fellow colleagues, this is a severe, a severe

breach of American security, and has put our country in jeopardy. We are not just talking about American satellites. Again, when we hear the issue discovered, those people who talk about satellites, are trying to confuse the issue. What we are really talking about is the upgrading of a nuclear weapons delivery system in the hands of the Communist Chinese, a weapons system that is designed to hit American cities and vaporize millions of our own people.

Shame on Loral and any other American company involved in providing this assistance to a potential enemy of the United States of America.

Another aerospace company, Motorola, appears to have been involved in advancing Chinese ballistic missile capabilities as well. In this case, Motorola took a Chinese rocket, not the same one that we are talking about with Loral and Hughes, took a Chinese rocket, called the Chinese long march 2-C rocket and upgraded its capabilities. The long march 2-C was a relatively reliable system, unlike the other one that we are talking about that Hughes and Loral were dealing with. It had in fact flown 14 times before the Americans came around to use it in order to launch a new generation of communication satellites.

The problem with launching those satellites was that it was a reliable system, but it really was not as capable as Motorola and other companies wanted it to be. In fact, as long as it saved money and did not enhance the Chinese ability to attack its enemies, meaning the United States, it was okay for Loral to use that system, because it was reliable and they had done that on their own, the Chinese had developed that on their own.

What happened was this: In all of the launches of that Chinese long march 2-C rocket before Motorola showed up with its engineering advice and sophisticated technology, in all of those launches, the Chinese rocket that we are talking about only carried one payload. In the launches afterwards, after Loral had 40-some engineering meetings with the Chinese, and after Loral gave them certain technologies, the Chinese rocket that we are talking about went from carrying one payload to carrying two payloads.

Now, that may not sound very threatening, but let me put it this way: American technology was then used to double the capacity of a Communist Chinese missile system. This is called MIRVing. When we have only one payload and then we take it to two or more payloads, it is MIRVing. This is the ability to dispense more than one projectile from a rocket, whether it is a satellite or a nuclear warhead. That is from one rocket, more than one payload is MIRVing. And so others will know why that is a threat, instead of just destroying one city, that rocket now could destroy two American cities rather than just one American city. Is that important that we have doubled

their capability of this rocket system to destroy American cities and obliterate our countryside with just one missile? Yes, that is really important.

The frightening fact screams out at us. China did not have MIRVing capability for this system before the iridium satellite contract was signed with Motorola. However, on September 1, and here is a quote from the Chinese themselves, on September 1, 1997, the official Communist Chinese news agency reported, and I quote: A Chinese long march rocket carrier containing two simulations, two simulations of iridium satellites owned by the American electronic giant Motorola was successfully launched.

And here is the hook to it. The carrier, based on the long march 2-C, was the first of its type ever launched. Why was it the first of its type? Because it carried two satellites, two payloads instead of one.

An American company essentially doubled the capacity of a Communist Chinese rocket system to carry payloads. Both payloads may be deadly payloads that would put millions of American lives in jeopardy.

In addition, Motorola officials confirmed to me that they have provided the Chinese with technology such as exploding bolts. Exploding bolts. That is the technology that facilitates the stage separation of rockets. So that if a rocket is taking off, some of the times the Chinese rockets that were taking off before Loral and Hughes and Motorola got over there, they tried to separate their stages, and they would just explode.

That is what was explained to me the first time I heard about this. And I looked at the engineer, the American engineer who was telling me about this, and I said, you know, I think it is a good thing when Chinese rockets explode. We like it when Chinese rockets explode, because those rockets then cannot come over here and kill our loved ones.

Well, at first the company was turned down, Motorola, when they wanted to give some of these technologies, these exploding bolts that facilitate MIRVing and stage separation technology, they were turned down. They were turned down in their attempt. Just as perhaps Bernie Schwartz was turned down on some of these requests early on to sell weapons technology to the Chinese, they were turned down to sell these exploding bolts to the Chinese. But through a Clinton administration sleight of hand, by readjusting the paperwork, the licensing process moved forward, and this technology, which helps the rockets, was moved from the rocket category, which is illegal for these companies to transfer to the Communist Chinese, it was moved to the satellite list simply by reworking the paperwork.

Now, it is permissible for them to give this technology, before it was illegal. The end result: Communist Chinese, who are infamous copy cats,

these people spend billions of dollars trying to copy American ideas and technology and engineering, these famous copy cats ended up with 40 of these incredibly precise and sophisticated pieces of aerospace engineering.

□ 1200

We do not expect them to try to copy this when it gives them the ability to perfect their own missile system.

Motorola indicated to me that they wanted to provide me with information that would convince me that they were not guilty of betraying the security of our country. Unfortunately, they have not been willing to provide me with any more information and suggesting, instead, well, we are only going to talk to the Cox committee which is, as I said, now just getting organized.

Frankly, I look at this as a stall and will let the public and my colleagues determine for themselves whether they think that this is a stall or an attempted coverup.

I gave Motorola every opportunity to correct what they said was a false impression on my part. They decided not to provide me with information, knowing that I would be speaking to the House of Representatives as well as to the American people on this issue.

I will continue to speak to the House of Representatives and the American people on this issue and continue my investigation of this issue. If Motorola chooses not to make information available, we can only think the worst of them for it.

The Hughes Corporation, on the other hand, has tried to be cooperative. The company has some serious questions to answer in regard to three satellite launches in China that did not have U.S. security monitors present.

Under U.S. regulations, security monitors were needed. They had to be there. It was required that they be there for all the launches in China. Yet, they were not there at three of these major launches.

Why was that? Hughes Aircraft and Hughes Electronics understood the necessity, the legal requirement for these launches to be monitored. Hughes is making, however, as I say, information and personnel available to me so that if mistakes were made, we can talk about them and they can be corrected. I take that as an act of good faith on the part of Hughes.

One question I will be asking is why Hughes hired the son of a general, of a Chinese Communist general, to be involved in their own program. In fact, the son of the general they hired is the general who was in charge of China's own military satellite program. We need to know the role that this man played in that company, the son of a Communist Chinese general, as well as whether he has had a hand in some of these sensitive decisions as well as access to this very sensitive U.S. aerospace technology.

Hughes must explain the role that they have given to Dr. Wah Lim. They

hired Wah Lim, Hughes hired Wah Lim as a senior vice president after the Loral report debacle was made public.

I will be reporting back to my fellow Members of Congress and to the American people upon the return from our August break. This issue should not be lost in the headlines of controversy that are now flowing through Washington, D.C. This issue is important to our national survival.

The central issue in this egregious breach of America's national security is whether or not China is a threat to America and to the peace of the world. Some people just say, well, I say we give Communist Chinese all this technology. Some people shrug their shoulders and say "so what," because they do not understand the threat that China poses to the world.

I believe that Communist China should be the ultimate factor in the determination of U.S. foreign policy today, just as containing communism was our primary factor during the Cold War.

The truth is that, despite utilizing some forms of capitalism, China is still a one-party Communist dictatorship. That has become especially evident in the recent attempt by brave democrats across China to officially register as a democratic party during President Clinton's visit to China. As a result, all of the leaders of that movement are currently in jail or under house arrest with constant harassment by State security forces.

When China was going in the right direction, I would not have been here complaining that we were too involved in cooperating with Communist China. I would not have been. But China is not going in the right direction. There has been a regression. It is becoming more repressive.

Ten years ago, before Tiananmen Square, the Communist Chinese had other elements in their society who were developing alternatives. They seemed to be accepting the fact that alternatives had a right to exist. There was an acceptance of certain kinds of religious activities in China. People, communications were opening up. It is going in the opposite direction.

The Communist Chinese, while becoming more totalitarian now, are also becoming more heavily armed and more belligerent. By the way, there is a white paper on China's national defenses. The document is from a leadership document of the Communist Chinese themselves. It was released last week. This white paper details China's own goals. It calls the United States and its alliance with democratic countries in Asia as "the main threat to world peace and stability." It calls our own defense pact, America's defense pact with Japan, "an infringement on China's internal affairs."

What, pray tell, might China's national military objective be? Beijing's white paper emphasized China's intention to use force, if necessary, to conquer the free people of Taiwan. These

are people that the United States, by treaty, have sworn to protect and defend.

China is also staking out its claim to all the territories in the South China Sea, including islands just off the coast of the Philippines, almost within view of the Philippines and Malaysia as well.

In partnership with the despicable SLORC regime, this is the Chinese Communists are in partnership with a regime in Burma, the SLORC regime, that is one of the darkest corners of this planet and one of the most malevolent and evil, evil regimes in this world.

Human rights organizations all over the world have targeted Burma because of this ugly regime. China is arming the SLORC regime to the teeth in exchange for raw materials, cutting down and destroying their teak forest, as well as having a hand in the drug trade, in the heroin trade coming out of Burma.

That is China. Of course it is important. In this, China, while cozying up to this dictatorship, actually supporting the dictatorship in Burma, is building a chain of military naval installations in Burma along the Indian Ocean that, in part, have lead India, have lead India to become more aggressive in developing its own conventional and nuclear weapons policies.

While China was assuring the world that it was against this nuclear arms race, and we have seen that in Pakistan and in India and what a threat it is, but while China says it is against that arms race, what has it done? It continues to ship and to smuggle components to Pakistan for their nuclear weapons program and their missile delivery systems.

This is really, perhaps, the thing that China is doing that perhaps causes a short-term threat, even greater than the long-term threat of their own missiles. If Pakistan and India began exchanging rockets and atomic bombs, millions of people will die, and it will be a tragedy beyond all description. China is helping people put these weapon systems together.

Even worse, during, and this is during and after, President Clinton's stay in China, our new strategic partner, because that is what the President is trying to say China is, our partner, this villainous, evil regime is this strategic partner, even while he was there trying to make friends with them so they would be good guys, the Communist Chinese continued to transfer weapons of mass destruction technology and know-how to Iran and Libya while the President was there.

This was confirmed to me by a State Department official last week during a House Committee on International Relations hearing. The Communist Chinese have more than earned their title as the number one on the CIA's list of major proliferators of weapons of mass destruction technology.

However, the most egregious demonstration of contempt, contempt for

the people of the United States and contempt for President Clinton, was demonstrated when Beijing successfully tested an engine for a whole new generation of long-range ICBMs. This weapon that can hit the United States from mobile missiles launched in China, this engine for this new rocket was tested while President Clinton was right there in Beijing saying, let us be friends. Let us be friends. This is worse than Neville Chamberlain and his efforts to try to befriend Adolf Hitler in order to prevent aggression just prior to World War II.

The people in Beijing, these dictators, these gangsters, are laughing at the United States of America and laughing at us. Why not? We are helping them modernize their weapons systems. We are actually giving them the money that they need to do it, as well as the expertise of what they need.

Oh, this is the same group of people, the Butchers of Tiananmen Square. Will they show the people of the United States the same kind of mercy they showed their own people when they mowed them down, thousands of young people who wanted democracy 10 years ago, snuffed out?

Will they show us the same bed of mercy they showed the people of Tibet? Right now, the people of Tibet are going through a systematic genocide. Communist China could incinerate all of Tibet, and our big corporations will still come to us and say, oh, we are going to make them more moderate and democratic and peaceful if we just simply continue in this trade relationship in which they enrich themselves and get our technology.

What do we get? Well, a few corporations get rich, but most Americans end up with a pink slip and out of work because their job is shipped to slave labor in China.

Will they demonstrate to the American people the same type of mercy that they have shown to their own women? Women in China, millions of them, are forced to get abortions after they have conceived a baby, an incredible violation of millions of people with an incredible violation of human rights of women.

Will we trust the survival of our precious freedom and our peace basically to help this regime that systematically persecutes believers in God, whether they be Muslims or whether they be Christians or Tibetan Buddhists?

Should we continue to subsidize a nation with Most Favored Nation status, Most Favored Nation status which gives them an unfair advantage over us; that holds, and this country has a \$40 billion annual trade surplus with the United States all the time while breaking every promise to abide by the international standards respecting our own patents and our own intellectual property rights.

They are the biggest thieves of America's intellectual property. They are stealing billions of dollars from our creators in Hollywood and in Broadway and our musicians and our filmmakers.

Every year, they steal billions of dollars. Even before we can sell it overseas, they are reproducing these things, giving us no royalties, undercutting our own people from getting their just rewards for what they are creating, not to mention the intellectual property rights when they steal our technology and use our ideas to outcompete us and put our people out of work.

How does China maintain this huge advantage? Of course we have permitted China to have a 30 or 40 percent tariff on our goods. When our people want to sell over in China, they end up paying 30 or 40 percent tariffs. When they come to sell their goods in our country, they are only charged 3 or 4 percent.

They have slave labor there as compared to our free labor, and they flood our markets with these consumer goods, putting our people out of work. These businesses say, oh, we have to maintain the status with China. Why? Because we want to sell our products there.

That is baloney. These big businesses do not want to sell our products there because China is demanding, in order to sell products there, we have to build a manufacturing unit. This is not fair trade. We are being saps. We negotiated the well-being of our own people away. Now we are putting our country's security in jeopardy.

It is basically what we are engaged in in China economically is little more than corporate welfare subsidized by U.S. taxpayers who end up guaranteeing the investments of these corporations in China through the Export-Import Bank, in other words. Then our taxpayers guarantee the investments there. They set up the companies. They use the slave labor. They do not sell in China. They export them back to the United States, and they put out of work the taxpayers, the working people who are subsidizing and guaranteeing their investments in the first place. It is a sin against our people.

This is the kind of China that we are struggling to maintain a good relationship with, and, oh, let us not cause any problems. Let us not say anything. Let us not confront them with the evil doings and the buildup of their nuclear weapons industry or confront them, that they are threatening us or our friends or democracy or undermining the peace of the world interest.

We have got to be quiet about these things because of what? Because some huge multinational corporations are making a short-term profit. In the end, what will happen to those corporations? I will tell you. They will be expropriated. They will be expropriated, or the American people will lose out.

In order to sell to China, the few companies that are able to sell to China, as I say, are forced to set up these manufacturing units. This has happened in the aerospace industry. What those leaders in the aerospace industry are doing are taking the short

term. They are saying, yes, we will make a profit, a huge billion dollars profit this year, even though it means we are setting up a manufacturing unit in China that 2 years from now or 5 years or 10 years from now will be used to outcompete the American aerospace industry.

We are selling out the jobs of our people in the long run in order for a short-term profit for these companies. It is wrong. It is wrong.

These are unfair advantages of what? They have given the Communist Chinese \$40 billion, \$50 billion a year to build up their military. Why do we continue with this insane policy? It is an insane policy.

It has even led to the point that we are giving them rocket technology which they are aiming their rockets at us. So why do we continue this? How is it possible?

This body, my colleagues, ends up voting a majority to provide a trading status for this type of regime. Why is it? Yes, there is a handful of big corporations who are making immense short-term profits but, of course, that would not sell it here. The selling pitch is that by continuing this relationship with China, continuing this relationship with China, we are making them more democratic. We are going to make them liberal. It's the a hug-a-Nazi theory, and the Nazi will become a liberal democrat.

It is ridiculous what is actually happening. Instead of making the Communist Chinese more democratic, instead of our corporations over there interacting with the people of China and making them more democratic, what has happened is just the opposite.

By the way, the people of China are our friends. We are not talking about the people of China. We are talking about the oppressors and the Fascist government that holds them in a powerful grip. They know they are gangsters. They know they are bad guys. They know they are a clique that is holding a country of a billion people under submission. They think we are saps by playing a game by not confronting them with that.

What is actually happening, we are not making them more democratic. The Communist Chinese are corrupting our democratic processes. This corruption is, was epitomized by the millions of dollars that China may well have poured into the 1996 U.S. election campaign of President Clinton and Vice-President GORE and to the Democratic Party.

Do you remember, does everyone here remember the impoverished Buddhist monks that supposedly gave \$5,000 checks to Vice-President GORE when he was out campaigning in California at that Buddhist temple? Everybody knows we are not supposed to have fund-raisers at a religious institution.

Where do those \$5,000 checks come from? Those were impoverished Buddhist monks. I mean, our economy is

not doing that well that even impoverished Buddhist monks can give \$5,000 donations. Where did it come from?

We are talking about money being funneled into the American democratic process in order to what? In order to further a policy that is contrary to the interest of our people. They are corrupting us. We are not making them more democratic.

What about Loral president, Bernie Schwartz, the man we first talked about, the man who is pushing selling weapons technology that can kill American military personnel, a man who was over there, responsible for overseeing this company that upgraded these Chinese missiles and, as the Defense Department says, put our country's security at risk and has harmed our national security? This was the largest single contributor to the Democratic Party and to President Clinton's reelection effort in the last campaign. The largest single contributor.

Again, it is aimed at China policy. China policy. They are corrupting our system. Chinese officials from their own aerospace companies tried to channel hundreds of thousands of dollars into the Clinton campaign. Much of it was discovered and returned.

But what is important was this was not just a Chinese aerospace company. We are talking about a Chinese aerospace company that, like most of their companies, are nothing more than a front for the People's Liberation Army. That means the military in China was trying to channel money into our election process. The People's Liberation Army.

We do not know if millions of dollars did not end up in the President's reelection campaign. It looks like some did. But that is one thing that we will be looking into.

Our policies in regards to China are, at the very best, amoral. At the very best, they are saying set morality aside. Be practical. That is at the best. But more likely, our policies have to be considered by people around the world as immoral as policies based on certain people profiting from activities that they know to be contrary to any standards and values held by the American people.

Someday, there will be a price to pay for this type of immorality that is set in policy. There is a symmetry in the universe. When a person or when a country engage in this type of blatant immorality and ignores the standards that have been given to us and the values that we believe in, that our Founding Fathers and their American people believe in, there will be a price to pay. It inevitably leads to the pit of deprivation of defeat and despair.

The Adolf Hitlers of the world and the Al Capones of the world always end up in the ash heap of history, in the rogue's gallery. But we Americans should demand a higher standard. If we do not, we will pay the price. Our children will pay the price. Already we are paying the price economically with

jobs lost here going to slave labor in China.

We won the Cold War, not by compromising with evil. We won the Cold War because we looked at the Soviet Union, and Ronald Reagan called it an evil empire and we sought to contain it and to make sure that it was not in any way assisted as long as it posed this threat to the democratic nations of the world.

We never gave Most Favored Nation status to the Soviet Union. Never. Ronald Reagan would have thought it was a joke to give more trade and permit the Russians to have more hard currency through trade with the United States in order to make them nicer.

No. We said in order to have a closer relationship with us, you have got to become a freer society. You have got to open up so that religious people and people who disagree with you have rights to speak.

You have got to quit the genocide on different peoples in Tibet and elsewhere. And do you know what? Essentially those vicious people who ran the government and the Soviet Union and the Kremlin, they collapsed. They cracked because we took a moral stand.

Yes, we played China off against the Soviet Union during the Cold War, just as we played Stalin off against Hitler when Hitler and the Japanese were the major threats to the security and the peace of the world. Yes, we did that. But the Cold War is over. The China card no longer needs to be played.

In fact, China has replaced the Soviet Union, as the Soviet Union replaced Hitler, as the country and the people that we need to be concerned about to maintain the peace of the world, the greatest threat to our economic security, the greatest threat to the peace and the greatest threat to freedom.

Some people are surprised to see, my gosh, it has even gone so far that we were giving these people nuclear weapons. Why be surprised? Why be surprised at that? What is the result of this? All over the world this is known. Our policies of weakness towards China are known.

In Japan, what is going to happen with Japan? Japan is going through a crisis. If we are not strong and we do not provide leadership and we do not stand for the things that give us the strength of a Nation, give us the right to reach out to the rest of the people of the world and say let us lead the way, those people will go in another direction. They will be on their way. Their leadership will cut deals with the gangsters that threaten the world.

What will happen in Japan? What would happen if Japan said, uh-oh, this part of the world is now going to be dominated with Communist China. We better cut our deals with Beijing. This will be a far different world 50 to 100 years from now if that happens. It will be a world in which our children and our grandchildren will suffer greatly and the threat will be enormous.

What about in India? Why did India have to explode its nuclear weapon? Why did Pakistan move forward? Yes, they have their own problems. But at the same time, India is watching China. India is watching China. They might be able to handle a threat from Pakistan, but China? Maybe the democratic countries of the world, even in Thailand.

But let us take this out. What about those people who are struggling to build democracy? What about the former Soviet Union? In Russia, these people are struggling. Any factor can turn Russia this way or that way.

The United States is not seen as a powerful strong force for freedom; and, instead, we are letting the Chinese dominate this huge part of the planet. Russia borders on China.

What about the bad guys in Russia? What about the evil forces in Russia? They will cut their deals with Beijing and undermine peace and prosperity and the development of freedom in Russia.

There are major consequences to these insane policies that we have had with China. We have seen it now with India, as I say, India and Pakistan. It makes it more likely to have a war there. Japan is drifting into an anti-American orbit.

In other words, these are significant issues. These are historic issues that we must deal with. The threats to America's national security and our future prosperity, well-being of our people did not end with the end of the Cold War. We have got to pick up the torch. We have got to be diligent. We have got to be strong, just as our Founding Fathers were, just as every generation has had to be strong in order to maintain this American dream.

There are many scandals that we are going to hear about in the next 30 days. This titillation is swirling through the capital. All this attention is focused on the so-called scandals. Let the American people not lose sight of what we are, what I am talking about today.

Let them not lose sight of what I call Missilegate, if nothing else, the fact that our own weapons, our own technology are being turned against us, and that our policies are skewed toward helping a dictatorship and impoverishing the American people to build up the billions of people in the mainland of China which, in the end, is stolen from them by an oppressive dictatorship.

I will continue to investigate this, and I hope the American people will continue through this other scandal to focus on this important issue. We will move forward on it, as I say, and I will give certain updates, especially when I come back after the August break.

But in the end, our vigilance as Americans, as the world's last hope, last best hope of all of mankind, it is our vigilance that will save us and save all humankind. We are the keepers of the flame. Let us not share the power of that flame with tyrants and the enemies of freedom.

#### KEN STARR'S LEAKS MAY VIOLATE ETHICAL GUIDELINES AS WELL AS FEDERAL LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to put in the RECORD additional information about the serious problems that may have been created by Mr. Starr's recent revelations about the extent of his off-the-record contacts with the media and his justification for those contacts.

□ 1230

The press coverage of this controversy seemed to have missed the forest for the trees by concentrating almost exclusively on whether Mr. Brill, in his interview with Mr. Starr, had produced conclusive evidence that Mr. Starr had violated the Federal law which prohibits the disclosure of materials related to a grand jury investigation. There is evidence that suggests that he may have done just that, and I am hopeful that the Attorney General of the United States, Janet Reno, and Judge Johnson, will take appropriate steps to credibly resolve these issues.

More importantly, however, many of the leaks attributed to Mr. Starr's office raise two additional questions. Namely, whether they violate Department of Justice policy and whether they violate the Rules of Professional Ethics.

What is the Department of Justice's policy? Well, it forbids government prosecutors from making any statement that will have a substantial likelihood of materially prejudicing a proceeding. Moreover, the guidelines specifically direct prosecutors to not discuss certain categories of information which are presumed to have the effect of prejudicing an adjudicative proceeding if released. These include whether or not the accused has offered to make a statement; it includes the results of any investigative tests; it includes any opinion as to the guilt of a witness or any opinion as to the possibility of a plea agreement.

So the Rules of Professional Ethics for the District of Columbia prohibit almost exactly the same disclosures as the Department of Justice guidelines. Notwithstanding these guidelines, which are fairly clear, we have seen numerous press reports that contain exactly this type of information.

It has been reported that Mr. Starr has won his legal fight to prevent President Clinton's lawyers from questioning him directly about numerous leaks that are alleged to have come from his office. It is not clear, it is unknown whether Mr. Starr claims some sort of privilege to prevent his direct interrogation, but his resistance is at odds with his public statements about the importance of truth.

As the question of Office of the Special Counsel disclosures continues to be reviewed, we should all keep in mind

that Mr. Starr's obligations go far beyond the legal requirements that he not disclose grand jury information. Any departure from those guidelines threatens to rob his investigation of credibility and also invites speculation about partisan motives.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE NORTHERN MARIANAS DELEGATE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to talk about a piece of legislation that I dropped yesterday, that I introduced yesterday, and this is the Northern Marianas Delegate Act to provide for a nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives to represent the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands. The Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands is the newest commonwealth and the only American territory acquired by the United States in this century.

Many people are familiar with the fact that the CNMI was the site of the famous battle of Saipan during World War II, but are less familiar with the history of that group of islands. Guam, the island that I represent, is part of the Marianas, but had a slightly different history since Guam was taken by the United States as a result of the Spanish-American War 100 years ago.

The CNMI, as I mentioned, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the newest commonwealth and the newest territory of the United States, came into the United States in 1976, after it made a free choice to have a close political union with the United States, they being formerly part of an organization, an entity known as the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

When the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands came into the United States in 1976, it was decided at that time, and the people of the CNMI were discouraged from having a delegate in this body. Then subsequently in the 1980s, a Commission of Federal Laws appointed by President Reagan in 1985 then recommended that the CNMI should have a delegate in the House of Representatives. The reasons outlined were fairness, democratic principles, and practical utility.

Today, the CNMI is represented, very ably I might add, by a gentleman by the name of Juan Babauta who is in an elected position called the Resident Representative of the Northern Mariana Islands. But he is not accredited to this House.

Frequently, we like to state in this body that this is the People's House, and that all Americans are represented in the People's House. Yet there remains one group of Americans who cannot participate in the debate over policy which directs their lives. There is one group of Americans who cannot